DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 547 SO 021 764

TITLE	From Snowbird I to Snowbird II. Final Report on the Getty Center Preservice Education Project.
INSTITUTION	Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Los Angeles, CA.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	50p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Art Education; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Development; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Resources; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Visual Arts
IDENTIFIERS	Discipline Based Art Education

ABSTRACT

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts has worked with teacher education institutions to develop ways of improving professional preparation to teach art at the elementary and secondary grade levels. Individual campus projects carried out at 10 preservice teaching institutions are summarized: Brigham Young University, California State University at Sacramento, Florida State University, Indiana Unversity, Northern Illinois University, Ohio State University, University of Kansas, University of Nebraska (Omaha and Lincoln), University of Oregon, and Texas Tech University. The remainder of the report considers concepts, themes, and generalizations developed at the Snowbird II seminar in Los Angeles in 1989. Factors that strengthen and inhibit the development of quality discipline-based art education (DBAE) preservice programs are outlined. Seven inhibiting factors and strategies for overcoming them are discussed including conceptual entrenchment of colleagues and students such as child-centeredness in the schools, the complexity of DBAE, insufficient time for faculty to plan and develop programs and courses, lack of an adequate research base, and insufficient funding. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

From Snowbird I to Snowbird II

FINAL REPORT ON THE GETTY CENTER PRESERVICE EDUCATION PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LEILANIE LATTIN DUKE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 021 704

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

© 1990 The J. Paul Getty Trust

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts
1875 Century Park East, Suite 2300
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Editor: Nicky Leach
Designer: Kurt Hauser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD
Leilani Lattin Duke v

INTRODUCTION
Stephen Dobbs vii

Project Summaries from the Ten Preservice Contractors 1

Concepts, Themes, and Generalizations Developed at the Snowbird II Seminar 31

Extensions and Disseminations 39

FOREWORD

IT IS A TRUISM by now that professional staff development is a key ingredient in any formula or plan to improve arts education in the nation's schools. The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, dedicated to building the role of the arts in general education, considers the professional education and preparation of teachers at all levels to be central to concomitant efforts to strengthen curriculum, to provide instructional materials, and to properly evaluate programs in the arts. Indeed, most of the national reports on American education cite teacher education as the starting point for major reform.

For more than seven years, the Center has collaborated with individuals, school districts, and teacher education institutions in order to develop ways of improving professional preparation to teach art at the elementary and secondary grade levels. This report, "From Snowbird I to Snowbird II: Final Report on the Getty Center Preservice Education Project," describes one such initiative. It is a follow-up summary to a previous publication by the Center, "The Preservice Challenge: Discipline-Based Art Education and Recent Reports on Higher Education," the proceedings of the August 1987 seminar at Snowbird, Utah. The present report chronicles the subsequent individual campus projects, a meeting of the project directors of the ten participating universities at "Snowbird II," and briefly describes the follow-up efforts to widely disseminate and share the outcomes of the projects with other teacher education institutions developing their programs in arts education.

We hope that the main message that comes through in this report is that when groups of professionals with mutual interests in art education—teacher educators, artists, critics, historians, and aestheticians—work together, significant changes and improvements can occur in professional teacher preparation programs. Better yet is to encourage each institution to develop its own program that respects the idiosyncratic needs, circumstances, and resources of individual settings. In that way, the very best possibilities for discipline-based art education can emerge and eventually have positive impact on the quality of art instruction in America's classrooms.

Leilani Lattin Duke
Director
Getty Center for Education in the Arts
Summer 1990

INTRODUCTION

Stephen Mark Dobbs
Senior Program
Officer
Getty Center for
Education in
the Arts

At the heart of the enterprise to reform and strengthen art education in American schools is the challenge of educating in the colleges and universities young people who choose teaching as a career. "Preservice" preparation in undergraduate and teacher credential programs represents the first opportunity for professional training. It is during this time that the teacher candidate first enters the "guild" or fraternity of professional teachers, usually culminating in apprenticeship to a master or mentor teacher and first-hand experience in the classroom. Therefore, the preservice period is one of intensive preparation and of powerful forces at work shaping one's attitudes, knowledge, and understanding as one stands on the threshold of a teaching career.

Obviously, it is desirable to help those engaged in teacher education programs in the colleges and universities to form a positive and progressive orientation toward visual arts education. Perhaps the best opportunity to influence attitudes is at the inception of a career, while the mind is fresh and flexible. It has been said that it is twice as difficult to alter teaching styles once teachers have been "out there" as it is before full exposure to the profession in classroom practice. The emergence of the multifaceted paradigm (including that represented by discipline-based art education) as a leading approach for the delivery of art instruction places an additional premium upon the preservice experience. Teachers are now expected to be more competent and well versed in a broader array of art information and production skills than ever before. Therefore, it is imperative that preservice programs be of high quality so that they can meet the challenges of preparing teachers for the new expectations of art in the curriculum.

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, which made a commitment to the program area of staff development, convened a series of meetings in 1984 to determine the role and status of preservice programs in art education. Over the next two years, a dozen meetings were held with deans of fine arts, art and art education department chairpersons, and other advisors to learn more about how colleges and universities went about preparing would-be teachers to provide art instruction in the classroom.

In general, these meetings revealed several important points: First, although many states had curriculum frameworks or guidelines for the teaching of art (including those reflecting the multifaceted paradigm), teacher education institutions

THE PURPOSE OF THIS MIX OF ARTISTS, ART HISTORIANS, ART CRITICS, AND AESTHETICIANS WAS TO EXPLORE THE CHANGES OCCURRING IN THE FIELD OF ART EDUCATION.

routinely neglected to embrace the concepts contained within these documents. The typical teacher candidate was trained without reference to, or even awareness of the existence of, the state mandates, almost all of which were developed with the input of teacher educators themselves.

Second, although many administrators supported the idea of a multifaceted approach to the teaching of art, one which would include not only studio production but also art criticism, art history, and aesthetics, the infrastructure of schools of fine arts and art departments tended to undermine efforts to achieve faculty collaboration and joint curriculum planning. Rather, each of the discipline areas tended to be a separate turf, with students in art education taking generally disproportionate amounts of course work in the studio, a token amount of art history, and virtually no art criticism or aesthetics.

Third and finally, even if faculty did occasionally cooperate on convergent or joint courses, team-teach, or take other steps to provide a more coherent program consistent with the emerging state guidelines and quality goal standards of the National Art Education Association, the lack of administrative support and generally low status accorded to such courses (often not required for a degree or credential) within departments and schools relegated such offerings to the background. Busy undergraduates and credential students trying to fit the higher profile program requirements into their crowded schedules could easily neglect building a satisfactory background for teaching the several dimensions of art.

As a result of these meetings and the themes that emerged from them, the Getty Center organized a seminar for teacher education institutions which was held at Snowbird, Utah, in August 1987. Fifteen institutions attended, represented in each instance by a team of four faculty from the various art disciplines. For many faculty this was virtually the first time in their careers that they had attended a professional conference with their colleagues from a related art field. The purpose of this mix of artists, art historians, art critics, and aestheticians was to explore together the changes occurring in the field of art education. The participants also discussed ways in which they might respond to the new challenges to collaborate and cooperate in preparing students to deliver competent instruction in art.

The Snowbird Seminar was a watershed in preservice art education for the

Getty Center and for the participating institutions. People went away from the week-long meeting, at which some two dozen major presentations were given, excited and motivated to strengthen the preservice art education programs in their respective institutions. This would involve developing awareness of and congruence with state frameworks and curriculum guidelines, creating new courses and modifying others to reflect the multifaceted paradigm, encouraging faculty to collaborate and providing the administrative support and structures that would enable faculty to do so, and designing and assembling new instructional resources such as videotapes and books of readings.

Subsequently, the Getty Center awarded contracts to ten of the institutions to implement individual campus projects that had their inception in the small group planning meetings that had taken place at Snowbird. These projects were carried out in 1988 at the following institutions: Brigham Young University, California State University at Sacramento, Florida State University, Indiana University, Northern Illinois University, Ohio State University, University of Kansas, University of Nebraska (Omaha and Lincoln), University of Oregon, and Texas Tech University. Each school was awarded $25,000 to further its own plan for building a discipline-based art education emphasis in its various programs. Of course, since these are very different institutions from all over the nation, the plans varied considerably.

For example, Brigham Young University developed a new foundations course required of all undergraduate art majors, not just those concentrating on art education, and revised other courses to reflect the DBAE approach. California State University at Sacramento created a new course in aesthetics and criticism and videotaped guest lectures in those subjects. Florida State University completely revised its art education program with a significant increase in units required and convergence among the disciplines in core courses. Indiana University designed and developed an instructional resource library with primarily nontext materials that could be used not only by teacher candidates but also by instructors in the local Bloomington area. Northern Illinois University focused its project on the creation of the "Aesthetics Resource," a box containing generalizations about the discipline that has traditionally received the least attention in art education programs.

Ohio State University also featured aesthetics by developing a new comprehensive course and concentrating on the pedagogy that leads to effective teaching in

EACH UNIVERSITY EXPERIMENTED WITH CHANGES OF ITS OWN DESIGN, AND EACH HAD SINGULAR SUCCESSES.

that area. University of Kansas explored cross-disciplinary concepts with a new course oriented to the teaching of major themes in the history of art. University of Nebraska linked the disciplines with a new intensive summer program in art education methods and a follow-up practicum. University of Oregon put its energies into developing the discipline of art criticism in its program and the creation of an interdisciplinary course. Texas Tech University pursued the creation of new courses and a Saturday morning program for local schoolchildren to provide a supervised practicum for art education students.

In March 1989, the ten project directors met with Getty Center staff at "Snowbird II" in Manhattan Beach, California, to assess the outcomes and impacts of the ten preservice projects. Each university had experimented with changes of its own design, and each had had singular successes and in the process had also learned where problems and challenges remained. All the directors agreed that faculty awareness, cooperation, and motivation were essential to the provision of a balanced curriculum in preservice art education. Only then could institutions, by modeling the appropriate behavior among their own faculty, satisfactorily prepare students to teach to children a balanced curriculum based on the four art disciplines. The project directors gave different emphases to achieving the goal of strengthened programs: some favored new courses; others wished to pursue the creation of new instructional support materials; while still others wanted to focus further on the political process of obtaining administrative support and changing degree and program requirements. But all the directors felt that the Snowbird projects had advanced their individual endeavors.

Because of the very positive feedback from the ten preservice projects, and the interest of the project directors in sharing with teacher education colleagues at other institutions what they had learned, the Getty Center agreed to fund ten project extensions in 1989/90 for the express purpose of disseminating project outcomes and products to a wider audience. During the current academic year the ten universities will be publishing materials and taking other steps to amplify the impacts of their own projects by spreading ideas and information. The Center's support will help ensure that the valuable outcomes that have been produced by the individual campus projects will be shared and utilized by other institutions.

What have we learned from responding to the preservice challenge? First, that when professionals decide to work together to achieve mutually important goals,

the familiar obstacles to change and reform can be surmounted. Faculty who are excited by the possibilities and effects of collaboration can teach and work with students in ways they had previously not experienced. Second, to provide students with the best opportunities to become competent in teaching a multifaceted approach to art, the curriculum of preservice programs must require and reinforce the knowledge base of all four of the art disciplines. The provision of such background will be essential to the later success of these teachers in delivering art instruction that meets the new state standards and those of the professional organizations.

Third, there is a tremendous energy and concern in the teacher education institutions to make changes in their programs that will make them current and capable of preparing young people to teach in the twenty-first century. At Snowbird, many presentations focused upon the climate and conditions for school and curriculum reform. The central impact of more effective teacher education, including education in art, was emphasized. The time is right for such changes. The American people, exposed to the flood of educational reform ideas during the 1970s and 1980s, are beginning to support initiatives that will improve schools. The present is the best time to capitalize upon the momentum of the public's concern for education. Initiatives in preservice art education provide opportunities to help build a teacher corps of which the nation can be proud. It is incumbent upon those of us laboring in the vineyards of art education to plant and nurture the seed in a new generation of teachers, who will help children learn about and experience the many joyful and life-enhancing dimensions of art in their lives.

PROJECT SUMMARIES FROM THE TEN PRESERVICE CONTRACTORS

A PROJECT TO STRENGTHEN PRESERVICE ART EDUCATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ARTS

Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Project Director:
Michael D. Day

PROFILE

Brigham Young University, located forty miles south of Salt Lake City, is a church-supported school with a broadly diverse student body of 27, 000.

The Department of Art is located in the College of Fine Arts and Communications. Organized into the areas of Art Studio, Art History, and Art Education, the department has a full-time faculty of twenty and approximately twenty part-time instructors.

The Art Education area has a full-time faculty of four professors and four part-time instructors. It enrolls approximately sixty undergraduate art education majors and fifteen M.A. students and is responsible for teaching a required course to approximately 400 elementary majors each year.

PROJECT GOALS

Goal 1 • Development of a discipline-based art education (DBAE) course as a part of the foundations program required of all art students;

Goal 2 • Comprehensive evaluation and revision of the Art Education B.A. and B.F.A. degrees to strengthen discipline-based components; and

Goal 3 • To conduct a seminar for faculty members from the Art Education, Art Studio, and Art History areas of the Department of Art, and feature a guest speaker who exemplifies the integration of art production, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics in his or her work.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS

1 • Four faculty members representing the three academic areas of the department developed a two-credit DBAE foundations course required for all undergraduate art majors. Four sections of the course were taught during the fall semester 1988, and the course was subsequently revised and improved. It will be taught regularly each fall semester.

2 • The Art Education B.A. and B.F.A. degrees have been revised and improved. The B.A. degree with K-12 certification has been restructured so that students can complete the degree within a four-academic-year period. Content of the four required Art Education courses has been revised, and three credits of the student teaching requirement have been transferred from the College of Education to Art Education administration.

The B.F.A. degree with K-12 certification has been restructured so that students can complete the degree within five academic years. Both degrees require courses in art studio and art history and a course in aesthetics and art criticism.

3 • The proposed one-day, discipline-based seminar for department faculty expanded to a week-long symposium of art lectures and events, plus the one-day faculty seminar. The symposium is being held again this year and appears to have gained the status of a departmental tradition.

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

An additional benefit of the BYU project is the ongoing development of an art resource center staffed by undergraduate students. The center's computers are available to elementary education students for their curriculum development work.

The faculty seminar, initiated to promote understanding of the role of DBAE throughout the faculty, has increased faculty interaction among all the disciplines. Ties across the disciplines were further strengthened by the fact that the art department chairman attended the Snowbird I conference. In addition, the university-wide, discipline-based art course that is now part of the foundations program required of all students has encouraged faculty integration and helped motivate future art education majors.

PRESERVICE PROJECT IN ART EDUCATION

California State University
Sacramento, California

Project Director:
Joyce Wright

GOALS AND OVERVIEW

The project was designed to revise and augment the existing curriculum for preservice art education students, to include each of the disciplines of art—aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production. The first and second components of the project, the design of a new undergraduate course in aesthetics/criticism and the implementation of a visiting speakers program, were intended to address the need for additional focus on these areas in the program for preservice students. To increase the potential use of the presentations made by the visiting scholars, the third component included producing videotapes of several of the presentations. Finally, to further augment the preservice art education program, the curricula of two undergraduate art education courses, Art and the Child and Art in the Public Schools, were revised to reflect greater integration of the four art disciplines.

ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES

1 • During the spring semester 1988, a new undergraduate course on aesthetics and criticism was designed. The course, Art 102, complements an existing graduate course required of all graduate students in art. The appropriate university committees approved Art 102, and it was designed and taught by Professor Kurt von Meier, during the fall semester 1988.

2 • A visiting aesthetician/critic program was designed to complement the aesthetics and criticism course. Nine speakers, six of whom were financed by the Getty award, made presentations to the class. In addition to providing a variety of approaches to confronting issues and problems in the field, the visiting speakers also contributed to the contemporary focus of the course by presenting working examples of current art criticism and aesthetic inquiry.

3 • Videotapes were made of six of the guest speakers in an attempt to extend the use of their presentations beyond the semester during which they occurred. Tapes of three philosophy/aesthetics professors—Keith Gunderson, Daniel Herwitz, and Rafael Ortiz—are finished. Tapes of three artists—Fritz Scholder, James Hanlon, and Morrie Turner—are being edited and will be finished by the end of April 1989. Each tape will be approximately fifty to sixty minutes long. The tapes are also being used in other art education courses, will be placed in the University Library, and will be made available

to university preservice and in-service programs.

4 · Two art education courses, Art and the Child and Art in the Public Schools, were revised during spring semester 1988. The first course is required of all prospective general elementary teachers and all art specialist teachers. The second course is required of all prospective art specialist teachers and is taken while they are doing their student teaching. Revisions of both courses were directed at achieving a greater balance and integration of the four art disciplines.

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

The CSU-Sacramento curriculum is a five-year program, and students must have a B.A. in art and pass the National Teachers Examination or complete the university's waiver program to be admitted into the fifth-year credential program. A course in elementary school art is required of undergraduate elementary education majors, and undergraduate students completing the waiver program take twelve semester units (credit hours) in art history as well as the new aesthetics and criticism course developed with the Getty Center grant. In addition, one of the required courses in art history must cover non-Western art.

One of the major outcomes of this project was that it served to open up lines of communication between and among the art education, art history, and art studio faculty members within the department of art. In essence, the project provided an opportunity for the art education faculty to educate their colleagues within the department of art concerning the depth and substance of the art education program. As a result, these faculty members are now viewing the art education program as a serious, academically rigorous partner and not merely as a service area within the department.

PRESERVICE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN LIGHT OF DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION TENETS

The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Project Director:
Tom Anderson

OBJECTIVE AND OVERVIEW

The principal objective of the Preservice Curriculum Development Project was to revise the undergraduate curriculum in Art Education in light of the tenets of discipline-based art education (DBAE). The process included an examination of DBAE, the development of a theoretical base for each of the four disciplines, and the construction of a new curricular framework and new course offerings for the undergraduate art teacher education program. This process was carried out in the context of the teacher education program at Florida State University (FSU) and as prescribed by the State of Florida.

INPUTS AND SUGGESTED CHANGES

Four FSU faculty members, selected from FSU's Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Visual Arts and Dance, and Education, prepared position papers articulating the content and modes of inquiry required in aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and studio production. Their papers also included comments from area teachers and former FSU Art Education majors about their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the existing program. This information suggested changes in the program, including the need to: 1) increase the amount of instruction in art history, aesthetics, and art criticism; 2) restructure the studio requirement; and 3) provide new integrative course work. A new structure was then proposed and formatively evaluated by the discipline experts, the department's curriculum committee, practicing teachers, and the art education faculty as a whole.

RESULTS

The result was a complete revision of the art department teacher education program, increasing the art education requirement from thirty to thirty-six hours, deleting two courses, revising two courses, and introducing three new courses: Teaching Studio Content and Methods in Art, Teaching Art History, and Teaching Art Criticism and Aesthetics. An increase in the number of studio and art history credits was also proposed.

The new program has now been ratified by the Department of Art Education School of Visual Arts and University Curriculum committees; it will be implemented beginning in the fall of 1989.

THE PRESERVICE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT SERVED AS A BRIDGE TO JOIN THE FACULTIES FROM THE VISUAL ARTS AND ART EDUCATION

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT FACULTY

In 1981, the faculty of the Art Education Department left the College of Education and joined the College of Visual Arts. This move allowed the Art Education Department to drift in isolation, and one purpose of the Preservice Development Project was to serve as a bridge to join the faculties from the College of Visual Arts and the Art Education Department.

Another purpose was to address the fact that Florida's institutions of higher education have not been preparing sufficient numbers of teachers for the state's public schools. The project provided an opportunity to build a new program that would incorporate the four art disciplines, utilize faculty from the other schools in the planning process, and over the long term prepare greater numbers of students to teach in the K-12 state educational system.

One of the motivating factors for improving the program is that in 1990 there will be a state-required teacher entrance-level test, and the responsibility for the success or failure of students will reflect on the art education program. The FSU Art Education Department is committed to the new program, but there are still changes to be made. The potential for growth can be seen in the fact that people on the outside—future students and other faculty—now have the opportunity to witness the importance accorded the different art disciplines, and the department's credibility will grow from this association.

ART IN THE ORIGINAL: DBAE IN INDIANA UNIVERSITY'S PRESERVICE ART EDUCATION

Indiana University
Bloomington,
Indiana

Project Director:
Gilbert Clark

GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

All of the first year's projected goals for Indiana University's preservice education contract with the Getty Center for Education in the Arts have been attained. Completely revised courses with new and/or expanded content were created to replace two methods courses and two field experience requirements that had previously been integral parts of the School of Education's preservice program in art education. The new courses have been designed to prepare teachers to understand, teach, and be comfortable with DBAE curricula. By reading, analyzing, and critiquing original writings by art critics, art historians, aestheticians, and artists, students have learned about, and become more interested in, the educational potential and excitement offered by the possibilities of teaching discipline-based art education content in schools.

The School of Fine Arts and the IU Art Museum, both separate administrative units at Indiana University, also have created a new course in which fine arts and art education students worked cooperatively to help create exhibition materials for use in the IU Art Museum. This course, and the new School of Education courses, have required new and binding levels of cooperation among the staffs of these three administrative units, and art education and fine arts students have benefited greatly. Responses to these three new courses have been positive and have far exceeded original expectations.

An instructional materials resource library that has attracted statewide attention has also been created at IU's Department of Art Education. Teachers can use this resource, consisting primarily of non-book materials, to teach learning activities related to art criticism, art history, aesthetics, and studio art. Generally, such materials are unfamiliar to most teachers but once seen are considered highly useful. Many local teachers and most of IU's preservice art students are now actually using these materials in their teaching.

CONCOMITANT BENEFITS

Concomitant benefits that have been observed are greatly intensified professional cooperation between several visual arts-related agencies and staff on this campus. As cooperative activities have expanded, the degree of mutual respect among those people involved has been raised to levels not previously observed. Students who have participated in this project have exhibited a new respect for art objects. The opportunities they

have been given to study the methods and concerns of art professionals, coupled with the additional opportunities to work with original art objects and art documents, have significantly changed their attitudes about teaching art. Opportunities provided to analyze and discuss art works as a critic, historian, or theorist have been cited over and over again as "significant moments." Becoming aware and understanding that classroom art activities can be very exciting, whether or not students "make something," and then extending this awareness and understanding to teaching practice, has made a major and significant difference in the IU students' response to their preservice education.

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

The fact that the Indiana University group was one of only two teams invited to participate in this preservice project from the colleges of Education included in the Holmes Group has been a source of some difficulty. The Indiana project involved the revision of three courses, the introduction of one new course to the Fine Arts School, the revision of two field experience requirements, and the revision of the art education program for elementary education majors to include more DBAE content and experience. The need for swift action caused by the short time frame for this project necessitated "bending" university regulations by revising and offering these courses before new course descriptions could be formally included in the university catalogue.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRESERVICE DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION

Northern Illinois University
Dekalb, Illinois

Project Director:
Carmen Armstrong

LONG-RANGE GOAL AND GRANT-SUPPORTED TASKS

The Northern Illinois University (NIU) project addressed the long-range goal of preservice art education articulation and course sequence revision.

Three major tasks that contributed to the long-range goal were:

1 · to develop and pilot test a required methods course in art education that focused on the use of instructional resources appropriate for implementing DBAE;

2 · to assemble, acquire, and develop resources for students to apply what is learned about DBAE to clinical experiences and in student teaching; and

3 · to conduct a seminar to give faculty in aesthetics, art criticism, art history, art production areas, and art education an opportunity to discuss issues related to DBAE and to contribute to the content of the new methods course.

The outcome expected was that students in the new course, and ultimately in subsequent methods courses and student teaching, would be able to apply the concept of DBAE because of this focused instruction and with the aid of resources procured through the grant.

Grant Activities Related to Each of the Above Tasks

1.1 The instructor for the proposed course became involved in extensive reading in the content areas related to DBAE in which she felt the least strength (aesthetics and art criticism).

1.2 A course outline, syllabus, and text of readings were developed and guided the introduction of content appropriate to DBAE methods in the new required methods course.

1.3 A twenty-four-item essay instrument was developed and administered to students completing a course that the new course was to replace in order to establish baseline data. The instrument was administered on the first day and at the end of the new course in the fall of 1988 as a pre- and post-test for the course.

2.1 Assembling existing art education resources that contribute to DBAE involved: a) reorganization of our art education area's Arends Resource Room; and b) cataloguing donated books, curricula, journals, slides, videotape, slide sets, filmstrips, children's art product examples, and reproductions. Other materials that existed elsewhere on campus were located and their availability publicized to art education faculty and students.

2.2 Approximately four hundred reproductions of paintings, drawings, posters,

AREA ART TEACHERS ARE REQUESTING WORKSHOPS ON DBAE AS A RESULT OF OBSERVING NIU STUDENT TEACHERS.

sculpture, jewelry, and fiber arts were acquired and laminated. Instructional resources developed by art museums were purchased (slide sets, videotapes, reproductions) that included informative educational materials. Art appreciation games and sample curricula were also acquired.

2.3 The Aesthetics Resource Box, a collection of resources and activities in aesthetics for children, was developed to assist in integrating aesthetics content in DBAE lessons, units, or curricula. This resource made extensive use of simplified generalizations derived from philosophic quotations about art as advance organizers of the art history, criticism, and production components of a lesson.

3.1 The Faculty DBAE Seminar increased the number of the NIU faculty Snowbird group and informed these professors about DBAE and the meaningful integration of the four disciplines involved in art education.

3.2 Seminar discussion groups produced many suggestions in keeping with the intent of DBAE.

3.3 Faculty members from art history and aesthetics made written contributions to the development of the new required art methods course and the Aesthetics Resource Box.

RESULTS

All the tasks proposed for the grant were successfully accomplished, and additional desired outcomes can also be reported. For example, availability of pertinent resources has greatly increased the integration of art history and criticism by art education faculty in methods classes for art and elementary education majors. Organizing the Aesthetics Resource Box by questions aestheticians ask, including sample teacher questions at four levels, has prompted art education majors to involve students in discussing ideas about art that emerge from their involvement in the DBAE-intensive encounter with art activities. Positive effects of the new course on art education majors is observed in their subsequent receptivity to DBAE, and in the effectiveness of their questioning strategies to involve students in a broader conception of art. Area art teachers are requesting workshops on DBAE as a result of observing NIU student teachers, and art teachers in NIU's graduate program have chosen to work on tasks supportive of DBAE in their programs.

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

Since support for higher education is not a high priority in Illinois, an important outcome of the NIU project was the development of skills necessary to compete successfully for art education support within the extremely competitive higher education marketplace. Limited funding has often precluded such things as field trips and purchasing art resources materials, and art education in the schools has been generally production-oriented. One of the positive by-products of the Getty contract was that in creating their own art resources, students became models for other teachers in the schools. Both art specialists and classroom teachers were able to draw inspiration and knowledge from their preservice student teachers as they watched these students create and utilize their "homemade" art resources. A second positive outcome from the project occurred when, in addition to art teachers, both students and administrative staff became involved in art advocacy efforts at local elementary schools.

DEVELOPMENT OF AN ART EDUCATION PRESERVICE COURSE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING AESTHETICS

The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Project Director:
E. Louis Lankford

PROJECT GOALS

The Ohio State University preservice project sought to achieve the following goals:

Goal 1 · Design and implementation of a college course providing intensive study of the theory and practice of aesthetics in K-12 schools settings.

Goal 2 · Selection of theories, topics, and issues in aesthetics judged to be of particular value for a discipline-based preservice course in art education.

Goal 3 · Identification of pedagogical skills and strategies appropriate for teaching the course and presenting as models for teaching aesthetics.

Goal 4 · The gaining of insight into children's readiness and abilities relative to confronting problems in aesthetics.

Goal 5 · Identification, review, and development of resources and curriculum materials to accompany the course.

Goal 6 · Development and use of instruments and methods for evaluation of the project as a whole and the course in particular.

Goal 7 · Enrichment of the preservice program in Art Education at Ohio State in terms of both content and method.

Goal 8 · Demonstration to the field of art education that aesthetics can and should take a place in the heart of art education theory and practice.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES

In the spring of 1988, the project was formally launched with a series of planning meetings involving consultants representing art education, art history, studio art, philosophy of art, and teaching specialists from elementary, middle, and secondary schools. Matthew Lipman, director of the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children, was an advisor on philosophical inquiry in relation to child development. Phase I of the project focused on gathering and reviewing related research and debating alternative approaches for meeting goals. Phase II concentrated efforts on the development of a course syllabus and the identification of needed and available resources for teaching. Following evaluation of the syllabus, Phase III concentrated on the final refinements of class activities, the creation and collection of teaching materials, and the preparation of evaluative instruments. During Phase IV, the course was offered for credit to students (during autumn quarter 1988), and evaluations of the course and the project were carried out.

The course was highly participatory by design. Students were immersed in aesthetic inquiry on the first day, and over time increasing attention was paid to pedagogical skills such as lesson planning, questioning techniques, curriculum design, textbook use, student evaluation, and the adaptation of concepts and strategies for diverse developmental levels and social/environmental context. Aesthetic topics included the theory of art, questions of value, the art world, artistic behavior, aesthetic experience, and the relationship of aesthetics to art history, criticism, and studio art. Students were able to test ideas through a field experience involving team teaching of children from K-12 schools.

EVALUATION AND IMPACT

In the summary of the evaluator's report, the course was deemed highly successful, "its particular strengths being the demystification of aesthetics and the potential for practical application. Teaching methods and materials developed for the course proved to be workable, and learning outcomes corresponded to objectives. The eagerness of the students is indicative of great receptiveness to this material, and a real need for it if DBAE is to become a widespread reality."

The course is slated to become a regular course offering at Ohio State University.

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

Like many other institutions, OSU has recently undergone significant program revisions as a result of both Holmes 2, the second report issued by the Holmes Group, and the State Department of Education's changes in certification standards. A major outcome is that the university will be in a transition period over the next three years as it changes from certification at the undergraduate level to certification at the graduate level. Thus, the placement of the Getty Center project in the overall future scheme is important.

An important goal of the new, highly participatory aesthetics course was to make both graduate and undergraduate students comfortable with and knowledgeable about aesthetics. Art discipline consultants were utilized, and K-12 art specialists who served as consultants were especially helpful because they helped to focus on the application of information and materials in actual school situations; however, mainly due to a

number of political factors, the course will not become a requirement for art education majors. It is one of three courses offered as options on the teacher preparation track. A second course focuses on art criticism, and a third deals with the general development of teaching art appreciation.

Because the art education faculty actively sought advice from the philosophy department, a spirit of cooperation has been maintained between the two faculties. Prior to development of the new course, students had been required to take an aesthetics course in the philosophy department, but that course did not prepare them to use aesthetics as art educators. The art education department is extending, not supplanting, what the philosophy department is doing.

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY STUDIES IN ART: THE TRADITION OF THE HUMAN FIGURE

The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Project Director:
Ann El-Omami

ABSTRACT

The University of Kansas Preservice Challenge project addressed the problem of teaching major themes in the history of art through a cross-disciplinary approach. The project was designed to develop a course that would become required for all undergraduate majors in art education, elementary education, art history, art, and design. The course was designed to provide students with the skills necessary to organize ideas and critical thinking as applied to: a) methods and materials in creating art; b) the historical/cultural context of the visual arts; c) critical and aesthetic approaches to major theses in art; and d) curriculum development and instructional strategies in art. Faculty representing four university departments identified those possibilities in instructional strategies and curriculum content that could integrate the four disciplines, and then developed course format, content, and materials over a two-phase, twelve-month period.

GOALS AND PRIMARY ACTIVITIES

The University of Kansas preservice project sought to achieve the following goals:

Goal 1 • To develop an effective course format and content that will provide an in-depth, integrated approach to the teaching of art history, criticism, aesthetics, and studio research (production) for the undergraduate visual arts education and elementary education majors.

Goal 2 • To implement the prototype course.

Goal 3 • To provide students with the skills necessary to integrate concepts and issues from the four disciplines into curriculum development and teaching strategies in the visual arts.

Goal 4 • To determine, through the collection and analysis of data, the degree of success of each component of the course, to draw appropriate conclusions, and to develop revised alternate approaches if necessary.

Goal 5 • To develop five instructional packets that include comprehensive reading and required texts, historical outlines, images, videos, instructional strategies, example case studies, suggested student projects, and research and application projects in the following areas: The History of Methods and Materials in Creating Art; Approaches to the Historical and Cultural Context of an Art Work; Critical Approaches to Major Themes in Art: History and Application; Aesthetic Approaches to a Major Theme in Art: History

and Application; Themes in the History of Art: An Integrated Approach to the Development of Teaching Strategies in Art.

CLASS FORMAT

Cross-listed in the Departments of Philosophy, Art History, Art, Design, Art Education, and Humanities, the class met twice a week for eighteen weeks. Tuesday classes were one-hour-and-twenty-minute lectures in art history and aesthetics. Thursday classes included three hours of research and discussion in studio production, art education, and relationships to art history and aesthetics. Guest speakers, research trips to museum collections and exhibitions, symposia, student papers, and research projects completed the course format.

SUMMARY FINDINGS

Through the University of Kansas Preservice Challenge project it has been found that: 1) the thematic approach to teaching the four disciplines is generally successful; 2) team-taught, cross-disciplinary courses are prone to being information-intensive, leave little time for student discussion, and require an excessive amount of reading; 3) such an approach to teaching the visual arts elicited evidence of strong support for learning criticism and for making critical approaches a curricular essential; 4) art history must be a curricular essential in teaching the visual arts; 5) objects and images must be understood in a time-place context; 6) there is a great need for more comprehensive instruction in the area of art education; and 7) there is still much disagreement as to whether an art education specialist is necessary for teaching art.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

Three thematic cross-disciplinary courses are being developed for implementation during the spring and fall terms of the 1989–1990 academic year:

1 · Asian Art History and Design: S. Lee Mann, Design Department, and Stephen Addiss, Department of Art History;

2 · Aesthetics and Art: Gary Shapiro, Department of Philosophy, and Robert Brawley, Painter and Chair of the Art Department;

3 · Methods and Materials in the History of Art: Michael Ott, Art Department, and

Timothy Mitchell, Chair of the Art History Department.

In addition, the course established during the Preservice Challenge project will be, with revisions, offered in three formats: 1) an academic semester course for undergraduates; 2) a graduate-level course; and 3) as an in-service course during the summer semester. To become required, the pilot course must pass through departmental and school curriculum committees for adoption.

MATERIALS PRODUCED

1 • Forty-five two-hour lectures including nine Art History: The History of the Human Figure in Art; nine Aesthetics: The History of Aesthetic Theory and Philosophy and the Human Figure; eighteen Introduction to Studio Research: The Tradition of the Human Figure; and nine Art Education: History and Philosophy of Art Education and DBAE.

2 • Three student research projects and one final research project.

3 • Five instructional packets in the areas of studio research; contextual art history; aesthetic and critical approaches to thematic teaching in the visual arts; integrated approaches to curriculum development; and instructional strategies in art education.

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

One of the project's major goals was that the newly developed course would provide a model for consolidating some of the courses in art history, studio, and visual arts education; the course addressed the problem of teaching major themes in the history of art through a cross-disciplinary approach. Another goal was to bring together outstanding faculty members from the different disciplines and to provide art education students with opportunities to work with primary sources of information. Joseph Goldyne's connoisseurship model for integrating the four disciplines was an important underlying factor in the course.

Since the University of Kansas art education major is not declared until the end of the junior year, the project was expanded to include initial certification students, those students who already held a B.F.A. or M.F.A. in a studio area, graduate students in the other art disciplines, and undergraduate art history and studio students.

The project's strengths included the art history and aesthetic content as curricular essentials in teaching visual arts and the presence of expert consultants. One

weakness identified was the need to better integrate art education with the other disciplines. Some of the more successful lectures presented connections between the history and philosophy of art education and the history of aesthetics, and the use of methods and materials and studio research.

One problem was that too much material was generated, and there was not enough time for discussion with students. In addition, more comprehensive instruction is needed to promote an understanding of how the history of art education and current practices fit with the history of aesthetics and art history and how all these disciplines have been taught in the past.

LINKING THE DISCIPLINES: A PRESERVICE COURSE IN DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION

The University of Nebraska
Lincoln and Omaha, Nebraska

Project Directors:
Marvin Spomer (Lincoln)
Frances Thurber (Omaha)

OVERVIEW AND GOALS

The two campuses of the University of Nebraska entered into a joint contract with the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in March 1988 to develop a pilot methods course in discipline-based art education (DBAE) for undergraduate preservice teachers. Based on the principal tenets of DBAE theory, a curriculum model linking process, content, and structure was conceptualized for the course. Twenty-six undergraduates (75 percent classroom generalists, 25 percent art specialists) who enrolled in the resulting three-credit experience were introduced to the theory and practice of each of the four component disciplines in the DBAE approach to art education: art history, aesthetics, art criticism, and art production. During Phase I, an intensive three-week session, a teaching team comprising experts from each discipline, as well as experienced art education specialists, worked individually and in groups with students at various facilities on or near both campuses, including two museums and an international artists' colony. Phase I focused on increasing each student's ability to select, interpret, critically analyze, and create works of art. Phase II, held during the summer months, provided reflection time for each student to create an individual curriculum unit based on his or her understanding of DBAE. Phase III, a brief teaching practicum using the students' written curricula in an actual school setting, occurred during the following semester. This field test for the written curriculum unit evaluated each student's ability to translate a theoretical understanding of DBAE into actual classroom practice.

The goals for this experience were:

Goal 1 · To enrich the existing DBAE base used in art education methods courses at the University of Nebraska-Omaha (UNO) and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL);

Goal 2 · To provide students with a clear understanding of the contributions made by each of the art disciplines, of their modes of inquiry, and of methods for acquiring information pertinent to DBAE in the classroom;

Goal 3 · To develop innovative methodologies for teaching both the essence of the component disciplines of DBAE, and ways of interrelating them in art instruction; and

Goal 4 · To develop teaching materials and models that could enhance future instruction in art education and in the art disciplines as well.

THE STRENGTHS OF THIS PILOT COURSE INCLUDED ITS RICHNESS OF CONTENT OFFERED BY A DIVERSE AND HIGHLY SKILLED FACULTY.

OUTCOMES

Expected outcomes included:

1 · heightened ability by students to design and teach discipline-based art content in an actual classroom setting based on their expanded conceptual understanding of DBAE;

2 · heightened ability by the art discipline and art education faculty on the teaching team to develop materials, methods, and instructional strategies to enhance instruction in art education methods courses and in art discipline–related courses as well; and

3 · strengthened ties among faculty in the art disciplines on each campus and between campuses of the University of Nebraska system.

Continued research into refining this methods course will address the issues of individual student readiness to learn and to apply difficult course content, optimum timing for presentation of course content, and designing the process of the course to allow for open-ended outcomes within a well-defined goal structure.

The strengths of this pilot course included its richness of content offered by a diverse and highly skilled faculty; its inherent structure, which provided for individual growth as well as for cooperative learning; and the nature of educational processes used in the course, which offered the opportunity to experience each of the four disciplines in an intense and personal way. One special aspect of the course was that artists, their actual work, and an encounter with their work process were used to integrate the key concepts of all four disciplines. The ramifications of this preservice course have extended beyond the original boundaries to include an impact on Nebraska's statewide effort in DBAE through the "Prairie Visions" project, an in-service institute in discipline-based art education for teachers in Nebraska.

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

The two urban campuses service approximately 80 percent of Nebraska's teacher training needs. Project planning focused on setting up a teacher training system to operate within the two campuses and to act as a model for the twelve other state teacher training colleges. An important long-range goal was the promotion of interfaculty involvement among relevant departments at all twelve teacher training institutions in the state, including dialogue and interaction focusing on the dynamics of utilizing the four disciplines in the classroom. For example, Thurber attended a class in the philoso-

phy of art, along with art education majors, in order to gain knowledge and experience in an area that was not emphasized in her own training. Increased faculty interaction has had positive effects not only on the preservice programs but also on the in-service teacher training institutes being developed for the State of Nebraska.

CRITICISM IN ART AND DESIGN: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSE

University of
Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Project Coordinator:
Linda F. Ettinger

CALENDAR

Grant Awarded: January 1988
Course Planning: February–September 1988
Course Implementation and Evaluation: October–December 1988

PERSONNEL

Ten faculty, one graduate teaching fellow, in roles of project director, consultant, project coordinator, evaluator, recorder, planner, and instructors.

PURPOSE

To examine a broad base of theories, principles, and methods of art criticism in an interdisciplinary course, presented to students throughout the School of Architecture and Allied Arts, including preservice Art Education majors.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Forty-five students examined theories, principles, and methods of art criticism in an interdisciplinary forum. The course was team-taught by faculty from Art History, Fine and Applied Arts, Architecture, and Art Education. Allen Temko, architectural critic from the *San Francisco Chronicle*, gave an invited guest lecture, open to the public, on the topic of "The Critic as Social Activist." Each instructor analyzed the issues of criticism from his or her discipline, and both similarities and differences among disciplinary perspectives were revealed.

A variety of course assignments gave students broad experience with art criticism. Students read and analyzed criticism, and theories about criticism, by authors from art history, philosophy, art education, fine arts, and architecture. They visited a campus gallery to learn how an exhibit was designed. Operating in small groups, they critiqued their school building. They met a well-known critic from a major national newspaper. And they wrote and gave an oral presentation of their own criticism.

PROJECT OUTCOMES AND IMPLICATIONS

As discovered by participating students and faculty, critical theory and history are still largely uncharted territory. Nonetheless, the salience of critical issues to contemporary

art and design, and the recognition of their significance to teaching and making art and design, gave this course both theoretical and practical relevance in the School of Architecture and Allied Arts. The course should continue to be offered and, just as importantly, to be further developed. The Getty grant paid for a great deal of excellent work that will have lasting benefit to students and faculty in the school. The Department of Art Education intends to publish a journal composed of the lectures delivered in this course in order to share the accumulated knowledge with a larger audience.

What we teach about art in the K-12 classroom will be directly related to what we decide is important in our orientation to education. As was dramatically demonstrated in the Criticism in Art and Design course, the goals of critical activity can vary, even in the related art disciplines. The very notion of disciplinary divisions in art education is problematic, particularly when viewed in the arena of praxis. As was revealed in faculty planning discussions for this course, artists frequently function as art critics; historians find it increasingly difficult to separate activities defined as "historical" from those defined as "interpretative" or "critical"; and architects often view the design and critique process as one and the same. Since school is a place for testing and forming ideas and practices, preparing students to engage in criticism required asking many questions including: What is art? Who is an artist? What are the important goals of engaging in art criticism?

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

Although the location of the University of Oregon's Art Education Department in the School of Architecture and Allied Arts furnished an appropriate larger context for developing the grant proposal, there has been little interaction among the faculty and students of the various departments. The DBAE initiative provided a unique opportunity for tying the school together.

The faculty agreed on a basic foundational interest in critical theory that resulted in a multidisciplinary course in criticism designed to incorporate interests of architecture, art history, art education, and fine arts/studio. The spring term was devoted to planning and involved interested (self-selected) faculty from the four areas. Working together in the planning and implementation of this course revealed that it is wrong to assume that art criticism means the same thing to an artist as it does to an architect, or

art historian, or art educator. Purposes, contexts, and methods of art criticism can differ dramatically. We discovered that there was great value in acknowledging and analyzing these differences, rather than trying to formulate consensus. Articulation and understanding of differences contributed to the richness of information shared among students and faculty, and the overall experience helped to improve cross-departmental communication within the school.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM EMPHASIZING DISCIPLINE-BASED CONTENT IN THE VISUAL ARTS

Texas Tech
University
Lubbock, Texas

Project Director:
Terry Morrow

This project involved five goals. Four related to the design and development of courses pertaining to a comprehensive program for art teacher preparation. A fifth goal related to the development of a children's Saturday art program to be located in the Texas Tech University Museum. The Saturday art program will provide for a supervised practicum for preservice art specialists.

GOAL STATEMENTS, DISCUSSION OF OUTCOMES, RESULTS AND IMPACTS

Goal 1 · To plan a course (Art 3363, Arts and Ideas) that will focus on major aesthetic theories and theories of criticism and to prepare a draft text to aid instruction in this course.

Outcomes include the preparation of a course outline featuring a debate focusing on "formalist" and "semiotic" theories. The draft text prepared includes a variety of supporting materials for each major course theme.

Goal 2 · To plan a course (Art 3364, The Disciplines of Art) that will focus on each of the four art disciplines, the manner in which they differ and relate, and the ways in which the integration of these disciplines enhances comprehensive learning about the visual arts.

Outcomes include the formulation of teaching formats that promote an understanding of current rationales for learning about art and the interrelationship of the four art disciplines in this learning. In addition, readings to develop an understanding of the four art disciplines have been identified, and exemplary lesson plans that integrate learning about art have been developed and will be utilized as a basis for learning in art in the course. Experience with these lessons will help students recognize the relationship of the essential elements for art instruction, as mandated by the State of Texas, to the disciplines of art. Finally, a course outline has been completed and materials compiled into a draft text that will be used by students in Art 3364 (Goal 2) and Art 4364 (Goal 3).

Goal 3 · To plan a course (Art 4363, Inquiry and the Visual Arts) that builds on the synthesis of the four disciplines gained in the previous course, Art 3364 (Goal 2), and which focuses on strategies for promoting and sustaining inquiry in each discipline. Provision is also made for sequential, integrated planning for learning about art.

Outcomes include the development of a course outline, teaching formats

relating to lesson planning that necessitate an integration of the four art disciplines, and the design of a supervised practicum in which students will plan and present art instruction to children enrolled in a Saturday art program. This practicum will emphasize sequential, integrated planning, testing of various instructional strategies directed to promoting inquiry and learning in the art disciplines, the modification and adoption of art lessons provided in current state-adopted art textbooks, the value of art exemplars from all art traditions, evaluation and assessment of art teaching and the learning about art, and art instruction and the learning of art in a museum as well as a classroom setting. The draft text compiled for Goal 2 will also be used for this course. A handbook for students engaged in the Saturday practicum experience has been completed.

Goal 4 · To evaluate and revise the current art education course (Art 3372) required of students working toward certification for teaching in the elementary school.

Outcomes include the development of a syllabus, a course outline, exemplary lesson plans, and support materials stressing the following art content: 1) an examination of DBAE as a model for art instruction; 2) an understanding of the role of each of the art disciplines and their integration in art learning; 3) the relevance of the art disciplines to the Texas essential elements; 4) a consideration of art content as a sequenced curriculum; and 5) an involvement in structured lesson planning.

Goal 5 · To design and establish a Saturday art program for children at the elementary school level that will be taught by prospective art education specialists under the direct supervision of art education faculty.

Outcomes include the completion of preliminary planning for a nine-week program for children, the provision for a teaching practicum as an integral instructional component of Art 4364, the development of a student teacher handbook, and the acquisition of essential teaching materials.

COMMENTS FROM THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

After completion of their course work, all education students in the State of Texas, including art education majors, must take the state-mandated Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) before they can be certified. The test is based upon a comprehensive set of learning objectives (essential elements), but the art-related objectives are essentially congruent with DBAE, as they are based upon the four

disciplines. In addition, the legislature has mandated that the word "education" can no longer be included in the description of undergraduate art courses, necessitating a change in titles and formats. These courses are now listed as "content" courses.

The loosely coordinated state of our old curriculum in relation to DBAE objectives and these new state-mandated requirements made it imperative that we make extensive reconstitutions of some existing courses, eliminate others, and originate new ones in order to create and develop a sequential curriculum to meet these needs. Indeed, the development of this new curriculum included several courses not included in the study. In a happy confluence of circumstances, the university, well aware of the state-mandated changes, made the process unusually easy for officially implementing these changes in the curriculum.

The results of the project have been highly productive and very gratifying, although one remaining area of concern is the sheer comprehensiveness of the content for Art 3372, the service course required for all elementary education majors (Goal 4). Its syllabus includes discussion about the DBAE model, the role of the four disciplines in writing lesson plans, the relationship of the disciplines to the essential elements in preparation for the ExCET, etc. Unfortunately, it seems virtually impossible to give this information the depth of coverage it deserves in order that students may gain more than a rudimentary knowledge of these concepts in one three-hour course.

ONE REMAINING AREA OF CONCERN IS THE SHEER COMPREHENSIVENESS OF THE CONTENT FOR THE SERVICE COURSE REQUIRED FOR ALL ELEMENTARY EDUCATION MAJORS.

CONCEPTS, THEMES, AND GENERALIZATIONS DEVELOPED AT THE SNOWBIRD II SEMINAR

CONCEPTS, THEMES, AND GENERALIZATIONS DEVELOPED AT THE SNOWBIRD II SEMINAR IN LOS ANGELES

On March 22 and 23, 1989, in Los Angeles, the directors of the contractor institutions engaged in extensive brainstorming sessions, led by Stephen Dobbs, to extrapolate common themes, trends, problems, and solutions for strengthening preservice art education programs. Using the ten preservice projects as primary input, along with the individual experiences of the project directors, the group compiled a list of generalizations of two types: factors that tend to strengthen the development of quality preservice art education programs and conditions that tend to weaken the prospects for the success of these programs.

Under these two headings, the initial lists included a total of fifty conditions viewed as strengthening DBAE preservice programs, and more than thirty conditions thought to weaken the programs. The participants were asked to rank in order the most crucial factors in terms of their importance to the field as a whole. The final two sets of conditions for discussion—seven items in each category—consisted of those items that appeared on the most-important lists of at least half the participants. They are as follows:

FACTORS THAT STRENGTHEN THE DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY DBAE PRESERVICE PROGRAMS

1) Knowledgeable, competent, and committed art educators and art discipline faculty
2) Sufficient money for planning and development
3) Administrative support and leadership
4) Finding a means to influence faculty development
5) Attending to assessment issues and techniques
6) Maintaining a clear focus on goals and having a clear vision of DBAE
7) Knowledge of institutional policies and the politics of change

FACTORS THAT INHIBIT THE DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY DBAE PRESERVICE PROGRAMS

1) Conceptual entrenchment of colleagues and students, such as child-centeredness in the schools
2) The complexity of DBAE
3) Insufficient time for faculty to plan and develop programs and courses

4) Lack of an adequate research base

5) Insufficient funding

6) Lack of recognition for the development of a quality preservice art education program

7) The difficulty of organizing teams from different areas in the related disciplines

Next, the participants developed a list of strategies for overcoming the inhibiting factors, by using the strengthening conditions to bring about positive, progressive change in preservice programs.

STRATEGIES FOR OVERCOMING THE FACTORS THAT INHIBIT THE DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY DBAE PRESERVICE PROGRAMS

1 · Conceptual entrenchment of colleagues and students, such as child-centeredness in the schools

* Initiate dialogue with colleagues and students; seek opinions and use ideas.
* Design graduate courses and readings that provide exposure to DBAE.
* Use informational tactics and outlines.
* Provide in-service education to local teachers.
* Make presentations at state conferences.
* Use the expertise of reluctant university faculty.
* Promote retirement for selected individuals.
* Formulate a common vocabulary through establishing a broad-based advisory board.
* Involve the state art director and other administrators.
* Use the perspectives of others to build sound negotiating strategies.
* Organize teams from different disciplines.
* Choose to work with committed teachers who will successfully influence their colleagues.
* Organize a debate or panel, which may be confrontational, to exchange and inform opinions.
* Utilize good program planning in establishing an appropriate team.
* Establish a clear philosophical base that incorporates a well-defined vision of DBAE.
* Promote faculty development; e.g., a seminar to inform an expanded group (with state and regional representatives) about DBAE.
* Lobby, especially with regard to persuading faculty voters.

* Gain the consensus of an entire faculty through departmental politics; e.g., have members of the Snowbird team attend organized faculty meetings to promote DBAE.
* Deal with misperceptions about DBAE, building the paradigm on its merits.
* Acknowledge the pluralism; coexist with and learn from other value systems.

2 · *The complexity of DBAE*

* Focus on the possibilities of trade-offs in the disciplines (selectivity).
* Relate technical jargon to current practice; demystify DBAE.
* Show living examples; use videos, demonstrations, and the like.
* Deal with one part of the process at a time.
* Emphasize the enrichment aspect of multiple views or perspectives.
* Use course work to build knowledge, skills, and understanding in the disciplines.
* Organize teams for curriculum development.
* Establish a risk-free learning environment.
* Clarify differences between instructional design problems and curriculum design problems.
* Clearly establish what DBAE is and what it is not.

3 · *Insufficient time for faculty to plan and develop programs and courses*

* Tie planning time to research.
* Utilize research assistants.
* Establish and focus on priorities.
* Obtain external support (which leads to greater administrative support).
* Link the various aspects of the program (e.g., teaching, research, and service).
* Distribute course content and assignments across other courses.
* Seek funding for release time.
* Commit time to publishing.
* Create effective and persuasive mission statements.
* Promote the visibility and availability of institutional successes.
* Provide information; avoid reinventing the wheel.
* Profit from the division of labor through the participation of other colleagues.
* Establish the legitimacy of efforts within the official university system of recognition.

4 · Lack of an adequate research base

* Establish strong doctoral programs that encourage student research, to increase the knowledge base.
* Seek external support for facilitating research and networking.
* Focus on relevant problems in research (i.e., the field is small and needs doctoral student support).
* Encourage more applied research.
* Legitimize and reemphasize research in curriculum.
* Set up an external support program focused on research.
* Establish a shared research agenda (per the Cincinnati Issues Seminar, which dealt with issues in child development, multicultures, boundaries, and the forms the curriculum might take).
* Create forums to discuss priorities.
* Network and organize more of the research.
* Use the research base in other areas.
* Encourage translation of the current research base into effective practice.
* Encourage more field-based inquiry.
* Set up a small research project fund ($5,000 to $10,000) with specifications for research projects for both faculty and students.
* Establish opportunities for mentoring.
* Tie research into teaching.
* Support new faculty (small seed grants are often held for new faculty).
* Allow for more time in faculty schedules.
* Encourage better direction of post-doctoral research choices.
* Avoid coasting on doctoral or master's work.
* Focus on problems by channeling support to groups of students working convergently on one issue.
* Work toward a greater consensus in the field's goals with regard to DBAE.

5 · Insufficient funding

* Improve the information base on sources of funding (with the contractors contributing to a public list).

* Share resources (e.g., a two-campus project).
* Make better use of materials already on hand.
* Use existing support to leverage further support (e.g., additional release time and matching grants).
* Obtain equivalences, such as release or travel time and administrative support (in-kind).
* Be aware of year-end budget surpluses.
* Be alert to appropriate timing.
* Employ strategies when asking for funding; e.g., ask first for something you know will not be forthcoming, then make a more reasonable request (the "second no" theory).
* Seek seed money that provides leverage and matching.
* Speculate that reimbursement may be possible.
* Learn about and work the university system.
* Project a positive, productive, constructive image.
* Tie into a considered research agenda.
* Align the project with a school system, with practical projects in the community.
* Establish joint proposals.
* Seek materials rather than money (exposure of published materials could lead to free materials).
* Develop alumni support (e.g., through a telethon or a newsletter).
* Try cake sales and car washes.
* Consult the *Foundation Directory*.
* Use advocacy techniques (e.g., networking, sensitizing, and politicizing).
* Keep up with *ACA Update* (from the American Council for the Arts), *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, and other related journals.
* Work with campus grants officers.

6 · Lack of recognition for the development of a quality preservice art education program

* Relate the work to other modes of professional functioning (e.g., publications, presentations, and conferences).
* Use financial remuneration, even in nominal amounts, to acknowledge faculty contributions.
* Seek outside recognition from others, such as external funders or supporters.

- Build broader awareness by disseminating materials and information.
- Employ better visual design in publications.
- Establish awards for administrators and faculty; identify successful efforts.
- Promote greater interaction and dialogue among colleagues through more opportunities for publication.
- Make use of more collegial feedback (e.g., Laura Chapman used to write about the best articles in the NAEA's *Art Education* journal).
- Make better use of the media; educate locally (e.g., reports on the ten projects in the Getty Center's newsletter).
- Promote a greater sensitivity to gender—women and men as role models.

7 · The difficulty of organizing teams from different areas, in the related disciplines

- Seek affirmation for teams through outside support.
- Use simultaneous, concurrent enrollment and cross-listing of courses.
- Establish clear goals and roles for team members; understand how teams work effectively.
- Provide team members with different kinds of incentives, e.g., information for a publication, a research base, time off, funding, and service recognition.
- Know the target audience.
- Seek strategies to maintain the team once it is established.
- Develop relationships with potential change agents, such as deans and department chairs.
- Be prepared to replace team members; develop some depth of choice for specific roles.
- Provide for sufficient preliminary meetings to establish a team with a common philosophical base.
- Build philosophical foundations and a sense of ownership.
- Interpret to members of the other disciplines their stake in art education.
- Work through the professional associations and societies of related disciplines.
- Explore the possibility of articulating DBAE within community college programs.

EXTENSIONS AND DISSEMINATIONS

EXTENSIONS AND DISSEMINATIONS

Subsequent to the Snowbird II meeting of the ten project directors and the Getty staff in Manhattan Beach, California, in spring 1989, the Getty Center provided additional support to each of the ten universities to further refine and extend their DBAE projects, and to disseminate the outcomes of the projects to the wider teacher education community. Although the projects are in process at this writing, what follows is a brief description of the activities of the extension/dissemination projects at the ten universities. Those interested in obtaining additional information concerning any of these projects should contact the individual preservice project directors at their academic institutions.

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

The BYU faculty is continuing to develop its program through restructuring of the B.A. and B.F.A. degree programs, the creation of a new required discipline-based art course for all art students (including majors in studio and art history as well as art education), and the refinement of instructional materials for the new course. This final task will be the focus of the extension/dissemination project: the completed syllabus will be printed and shared with other art education faculty around the nation. The syllabus is the product of a continuing collaboration among art educators, studio artists, art historians, and others on the BYU faculty.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Cal State produced a new undergraduate course (Aesthetics and Criticism), revised other key courses in the teacher education program, and implemented a visiting speakers series with videotapes made of six of the guests. The focus of their extension/dissemination is on the videotape series, involving the production of a printed volume of the six videotaped lectures. The volume will serve as a companion to the tapes that can be used separately or in conjunction with them. Such materials might be utilized in a variety of teacher education settings, including those courses in art criticism and aesthetics.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Florida State University used its original Getty support to revise its art education program, including the deletion of old courses and the creation of new courses. The department succeeded in increasing the art education requirement by 20 percent and has

proposed other changes to strengthen the program. The extension/dissemination project is to reach other Floridians through a statewide conference at which the FSU project outcomes may be discussed and considered as a model for other institutions. The two-day meeting will be jointly sponsored by the university and the Florida Art Education Association, and its proceedings published and distributed.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Indiana made wholesale changes in its courses to teach DBAE, creating new offerings and making available for the first time to its students a wide array of curriculum and instructional support materials that facilitate the multidimensional approach to art. The development of the resource library was planned so that local teachers in the Bloomington area could also share in its benefits. The extension/dissemination project continues the refinement of the new courses and the resource library, and includes the writing and publication of a monograph describing the DBAE-based program at Indiana, including lesson plans and learning materials developed by students in the program.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Northern Illinois made changes along a broad front, including a new methods course, the development of special resources for the teaching of aesthetics, and the conducting of a faculty seminar to expand the discussion of discipline-based art education. In the post-project phase, Northern Illinois's extension/dissemination seeks to refine and disseminate the Aesthetics Resource Box, a collection of concepts and generalizations to support the teaching of the aesthetics component in DBAE. A manual that will outline the nature and scope of the box and that will provide samples of the resource is being written. Like other publications being produced by the Snowbird II group, this one will be free.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Ohio State focused in its year-long project upon the development of a new course providing intensive and comprehensive study of aesthetics, perhaps the most neglected area of DBAE study in most institutions. A course syllabus was produced, and the extension/dissemination program will refine and further develop that syllabus so as to

provide a major new resource in the field of art education. The result will be a "handbook" on the teaching of aesthetics to persons preparing for careers in the schools, both generalist classroom teachers and art specialists. Such a publication might be utilized as a course primer throughout the country.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Kansas's project experimented with cross-disciplinary approaches to DBAE by selecting a major thematic vehicle around which to organize its art history offerings. The course was designed not only for art educators but also for students in elementary education and other professional art areas. For the extension/dissemination aspect, Kansas faculty is producing a narrative account of the new course along with a detailed syllabus that will demonstrate how the various disciplines can be integrated. The text will be published in the *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, including suitable illustrations, and will be widely distributed in the field.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Nebraska's two-campus project at Lincoln and Omaha sought to revise a key methods course to fully reflect the multifaceted approach of DBAE and to build awareness and collaboration among faculty in the component disciplines. Students in the Nebraska program asked for more input about what DBAE looks like in classroom practice; therefore, the extension/dissemination project focuses upon the development and production of two videotapes to help build better understanding about content knowledge and methodology. The tapes will model instructional approaches and will be shared with the statewide Prairie Vision Consortium for in-service art education as well.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Oregon developed an interdisciplinary course focused upon the discipline of art criticism. It was team-taught by faculty and guest lecturers and addressed major issues arising in the teaching of art from the standpoint of the discipline. The extension/dissemination activity is to publish lectures from the course, commentary, and bibliography related to the issues of art criticism. The material will appear in an issue of *Controversies in Art and Culture*, a journal by the Department of Art Education at Oregon. This will enable other

educators to share in the exploration of issues provided by the course Criticism in Art and Design.

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

Texas Tech designed and developed courses for preservice art education emphasizing the contributions of the various disciplines and produced instructional packets for each of these, synthesizing considerable information from a great variety of sources. These are organized into a lesson-plan format that promotes the sequencing and integration of the art disciplines. The extension/dissemination phase refines these instructional packets, including the development of additional support media to accompany the written text. These expanded kits will be utilized at local and state meetings and with professional and parent groups to demonstrate DBAE.